

Peer Review of Extension Materials Authored by County Educators or Department of Extension Specialists for State-wide Distribution

(per the OSUE Policy Handbook - Last modified 2009-12-16 10:46)

Review procedures are designed to enhance the credibility and research base of OSU Extension publications, protect the individual's or team's work and strengthen scholarship credentials. Papers submitted to a rigorous blind peer review process in a journal or at national professional meetings do not require this review.

OSU Extension professionals are responsible for the accuracy and overall integrity of any educational materials or print pieces they author or produce for public distribution. These may be distributed through the web, mass media, educational programs, audio, video or other means. These are referred to below as "publications." Plagiarism and copyright infringements must be avoided. Use of citations and receiving written permission for materials, pictures or creative expressions of which you are not the original author is essential.

All publications (electronic or print) intended for statewide (or broader) distribution by county educators will be submitted for blind peer review by a minimum of three people. In practice, usually three to five people review the potential bulletin, fact sheet, audio/video, web or

educational offering. One of those reviewing should be a faculty member from outside Ohio. When state specialists (in departments other than Extension – *added by CD AD for clarity*) are authors or co-authors blind peer review is not required. However, the use of this blind peer review process is strongly recommended because it enhances the credibility of the publication.

Some items may be approved for an educator or team to share, but not as OSU Extension publications which are posted to Ohioline or published by Extension. For those items identified as OSU Extension publications, we will provide assistance in editing and layout if needed after the review process is complete. Guidelines published by Communications and Technology must be followed. Pricing is determined at the time of approval, if this will be a for sale OSUE publication.

Unit publications are published by County offices for local use and do not require peer review unless published to the web. County newsletters published to the web do not require peer review.

Submission and Peer Review Process for Ohioline and/or Extension-Published Materials

A. Submission of New Original Work

Step 1 - Authors

Authors should first complete an 'originality check' via Turnitin (<http://turnitin.com>) to ensure sources are appropriately cited. For a short video tutorial, go to [http://presenter.cfaes.ohio-state.edu/kulka.1/Using_Tunitin_for_Extension_Publications - Flash %28Large%29 - 20130117_02.58.52PM.html](http://presenter.cfaes.ohio-state.edu/kulka.1/Using_Tunitin_for_Extension_Publications_-_Flash_%28Large%29_-_20130117_02.58.52PM.html)

Following this step, authors of materials to be posted to Ohioline can initiate the peer review process by submitting a request for review (including the names and contact information of 5-6 individuals qualified to offer a critical assessment of the material) to Sandy Odrumsky (odrumsky.1@osu.edu) and cc Greg Davis (davis.1081@osu.edu) following the process below.

NOTE: Extensive formatting is not needed. Communications & Technology staff will format for uniformity on the website.

Per OSUE Policy Handbook Guidelines (approved 04/2006 and updated 11/2009) the request for review should include:

1. Cover letter requesting the review (this can be in the form of an e-mail)
2. Separate Title Page which includes:
 - a. Title
 - b. Authors' full names (this is the only page where authors' names should be included)
 - c. Authors' titles and institution
 - d. Complete mail address including telephone and fax number for lead author
 - e. Electronic mail addresses for all authors
 - f. Statement describing educational material: Is it print, electronic or web-based? Is it: a fact sheet, bulletin, curriculum; video audio, print piece, other?
 - g. Abstract not to exceed 250 words: Include a succinct list of the content including targeted audience and statement of need (as a result of review of literature and current related materials).
 - h. Submission date
3. General Requirements:
 - Submit one (1) electronic copy of educational material as an attachment
 - Citations are complete and use APA Publication Manual (6th ed.) standards
<http://www.apastyle.org>.

Step 2 – Review Coordinator

Within five working days, the review coordinator (Sandy Odrumsky) will invite individuals to critically assess the submitted materials using the template below:

Dear Colleague-

You have been identified as someone with expertise in the area(s) discussed in the attached scholarly/creative material. Please review the attachment and indicate in a 'reply' message to me whether you will be able to offer a critical assessment by (date two weeks from send date) using the following approach:

1. Print the attached OSU Extension 'publication' submission and offer written comments where appropriate
2. Complete and print the attached Review of Extension Educational Materials Form
3. Return hard copy or scanned electronic items 1 and 2 to me at the physical address below by (date two weeks from send date)

This is a blind peer review process and, as such, at no point will your name be associated with your review. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. If you know of someone better suited to offer a critical review of this material, I would be very grateful if you would forward their contact information to me.

Thank you, in advance, for your contributions to this review of educational materials.

Step 3 – Review Coordinator

Review ratings and comments will be forwarded to authors.

Step 4 – Authors and Assistant Director

Authors should revise materials as necessary and forward to the Assistant Director for approval. Authors should click on the following link and complete the form to send with the final revised copy for processing: TBD

The Assistant Director will make final approval and provide to the Review Coordinator.

The Review Coordinator (Sandy Odrumsky) will submit finalized material to CFAES Communications & Technology for posting. (NOTE: prior to posting, C&T will format a ‘proof copy’ and return for final review)

B. Revising Existing Original Work

Original authors of Ohioline materials should review materials they have authored for accuracy on an annual basis. Minor changes (e.g. date change, insertion of additional O.R.C. chapter, etc) can be forwarded directly to Communications and Technology (Scardena.1@osu.edu).

More extensive substantive changes may warrant peer review (go to ***Step 1 – Authors*** above).

C. Revising Existing Work of Others

Revision of Ohioline materials by someone other than the original author requires adherence to the following process:

1. Potential authors should identify Ohioline publications that are appropriate for revision and of interest to them.
2. Potential authors should determine whether the original author wishes to review/revise.
 - a. If the original author does not wish to review/revise:
 - i. The interested CD professional(s) can volunteer to lead the revision by indicating their intent in writing to the Assistant Director.
 - ii. If minimal changes are made, be sure to credit the original author(s). If a more comprehensive revision/complete re-write is undertaken, primary authorship credit will be given to the current CD professional(s) with secondary credit provided to original authors as necessary.
 - iii. Go to ***Step 1 – Authors*** above.
 - b. If the original author does wish to review/revise:
 - i. The interested CD professional(s) can offer to work with the original author to revise the publication.
 - ii. Minor changes (e.g. date change, insertion of additional O.R.C. chapter, etc) can be forwarded directly to Communications and Technology (Scardena.1@osu.edu).
 - iii. More extensive substantive changes may warrant peer review (go to ***Step 1 – Authors*** above).

NOTE: Publications deemed most out of date AND most relevant should be addressed first. The suggested time line for revising a factsheet and/or bulletin is no longer than three months which includes: author review, revision, submittal for peer review, peer review, author revision, resubmission for final approval, and re-posting to Ohioline.